

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-BFM

Date: March 10, 2025

Title: Todd R.G. Hill v. Board of Directors of Peoples College of Law, et al.

=====
Present: The Honorable Brianna Fuller Mircheff, United States Magistrate Judge

Christianna Howard
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:
N/A

Attorneys Present for Defendant:
N/A

Proceedings: (In Chambers) Orders on Pending Motions

The Court submitted an Interim Report and Recommendation on February 12, 2025. (ECF 213.) Objections have been submitted, and responses have been filed. The matter is thus pending review of the District Judge.

Plaintiff has filed three additional requests for relief. His request relating to the timeliness of the State Bar Defendants' responses to his objections (ECF 233) is for the District Judge's consideration. This Court will address the remaining two.

First, Plaintiff moves for discovery from the State Bar concerning PCL's accreditation. (ECF 231.) Under Rule 26(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, no party may seek discovery from any source before the Rule 26(f) conference, unless such discovery is authorized by court order. The Court may authorize early discovery upon a showing of good cause. *Semitoool, Inc. v. Tokyo Electron Am. Inc.*, 208 F.R.D. 273, 276 (N.D. Cal. 2002). Here, there is a pending Interim Report and Recommendation that would dismiss the State Bar Defendants from the case with prejudice and without further leave to amend. The Court does not, therefore, believe that there is good cause to

#8644
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-BFM

Date: March 10, 2025

Title: Todd R.G. Hill v. Board of Directors of Peoples College of Law, et al.

authorize early discovery from the State Bar Defendants at this juncture. The Motion is therefore **denied**.

Second, Plaintiff moves for judicial notice of *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*, 600 U.S. 181 (2023). (ECF 232.) Judicial notice is not necessary for legal precedents. *Lucero v. Wong*, No. C 10-1339 SI (pr), 2011 WL 5834963, *5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2011) (“It is unnecessary to request that the court judicially notice published cases from . . . federal courts as legal precedent; the court routinely considers such legal authorities in doing its legal analysis without a party requesting that they be judicially noticed.”). The Motion is therefore **denied**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

cc: Todd R.G. Hill, pro se
Counsel of record

Initials of Preparer: ch